

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed 28, 2007». Claims 21-42, 44-61, and 63-70 were pending. Claims 21, 51, and 67 have been amended without adding any new matter. No claims have been added or cancelled. Thus, claims 21-42, 44-61, and 63-70 remain pending. Reconsideration in light of the amendments and remarks made herein is respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejects claims 21-27, 29-39, 41-42, 44-53, 55-58, 60-62 and 63-70 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Cortjens (U.S. 5,526,037, hereinafter “Cortjens”).

Cortjens describes a system and method where a central controller has device-specific software that it transfers to network converters that provide support for peripheral devices (Cortjens, column 2, line 56 to column 3, line 15). As described in Cortjens, when a peripheral device generates a signal (i.e., mouse movement) intended to control a remote camera, the signal is translated to a network standard control signal by a network converter (column 2, line 50 to column 3, line 15; Figure 1, elements 11, 12, 13, and 18). The network converter communicates the standard control signal to a standard signal specific to the remote camera, in order to carry out the action of the peripheral device (column 6, lines 20-46; Figures 5A and 5B). In order for a network controller and network convert to control a peripheral device, software that both understands signal generated by a specific peripheral device, and which converts each signal to network standard signals, is required (Cortjens, column 3, lines 38-48). If a new peripheral device is connected to the system of Cortjens, new software must first be provided to the system (Cortjens, column 3, lines 38-48). A “user can then instruct the controller to load the new

software into the converter so that the converter is now configured for the new device” (Cortjens, column 3, lines 48-53).

With respect to amended claim 21, the Applicants claim:

A media capture device system allowing a logical user interface of a media capture device to be supported at least in part by a second device and a user-perceived interface of the second device, the system comprising:

- a module on-board the media capture device for determining one or more logical user interface elements of the media capture device that are supported by the second device and that can cause one or more user-perceivable interface elements of the second device to be activated, upon the media capture device being coupled with the second device;
- a module for generating at least one high-level event message indicating that an event has occurred that is relevant to the media capture device;
- a router on-board the media capture device for determining whether said at least one high-level event message is handled locally at the media capture device or remotely at the second device;
- a mapper on-board the media capture device for mapping said at least one high-level message into at least one lower-level message for controlling one or more hardware elements controlled by the second device; and
- a module for communicating said at least one lower-level message to the second device, such that the second device may activate one or more hardware elements, and activate one or more user-perceived interface elements of the second device, that are appropriate for said event that has occurred.

The Applicants respectfully submit that Cortjens fails to describe each and every feature as claimed in claim 21. Cortjens describes that a user must load the software, specifically written for a peripheral device, into a converter prior to use of the peripheral device. (Cortjens, column 3, lines 48-53) The software translates peripheral signals to network standard control signals.

With respect to claim 21, the Applicants recite in part:

- a module on-board the media capture device for determining one or more logical user interface elements of the media capture device that are supported by the second device and that can cause one or more user-perceivable interface elements of the second device to be activated, upon the media capture device being coupled with the second device

Cortjens describes that software must be loaded into a converter prior to use of a peripheral device, thus Cortjens fails to describe “a module on-board the media capture device for determining one or more logical user interface elements of the media capture device that are supported by the second device,” as Cortjens fails to describe determining any level of device support. Rather Cortjens simply describes that a device is not supported until a network converter is provided with specific software for a peripheral device (Cortjens, column 3, lines 38-53). Thus, Cortjens fails to describe any “determining of logical user interface elements,” as claimed by the Applicants.

Furthermore, because the concept of determining one or more supported interface elements is absent from Cortjens, where the determination is performed must also be absent from Cortjens. Thus, Cortjens also fails to describe “a module on-board the media capture device for determining.” However, even if Cortjens did provide for some determination of peripheral device support, the determination of support (i.e., a network converter either has or does not have peripheral-specific conversion software) would be performed by a user, who uploads software for a new peripheral device to a network converter, or by a network converter, which will not perform any signal conversion without device-specific software. Thus, Cortjens fails to describe “a module on-board the media capture device for determining one or more logical user interface elements of the media capture device that are supported ...,” as recited in claim 21.

Therefore, Cortjens fails to describe each and every feature as claimed by the Applicants in Claim 21. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 21 is not anticipated by Cortjens. Claims 22-27, 29-39, 41-50 depend on claim 21, and include additional features and limitations to those contained in claim 21. Thus, for similar reasons to those discussed above with respect to claim

21, claims 22-27, 29-39, 41-50 are also not anticipated by Cortjens. The Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections of claim 21-27, 29-39, 41-50 under § 102.

Amended claim 51 recites:

An interface system allowing a client device to be partially supported by a host device, the system comprising:

- a module on-board the client device for determining one or more user interface elements of the client device that are supported by the host device and that can cause one or more user-perceivable interface elements of the host device to be activated, when the client device is coupled with the host device;
- an onboard interface engine on the client device for generating at least one high-level event message indicating that an event has occurred on the client device;
- a router in the client device to determine whether the at least one high level event message should be handled locally at the client device or remotely at the host;
- a state transition table to transition the client device to the a new state based on the at least one high level event and the client device's present state;
- a module to update the client device's current state information; and
- a mapper for mapping said at least one high-level message into at least one lower-level message for controlling one or more hardware elements controlled by the host device, and for triggering the activation of one or more user-perceivable interface elements of the host device.

As discussed above, with respect to claim 21, Cortjens is completely silent as to making any determination of interface support. Even if the system of Cortjens were to make a support determination, the determination is not performed “on board” a media capture device. Because claim 51 claims “a module on-board the client device for determining one or more user interface elements of the client device that are supported by the host device and that can cause one or more user-perceivable interface elements of the host device to be activated, when the client device is coupled with the host device,” claim 51 is not anticipated by Cortjens. Furthermore, claims 52, 53, 55-58, and 60-66 depend on claim 51, and include additional features and limitations. Thus, claims 52, 53, 55-58, and 60-66 are also not anticipated by Cortjens.

Claim 67, as amended, recites:

A method comprising:
determining one or more user interface elements of a media capture device that are supported by a second device and that can cause one or more user-perceivable interface elements of the second device to be activated, when the media capture device is coupled with the second device;
receiving a notification at a the media capture device, indicating that an event has occurred with respect to the media capture device;
determining, at a router on-board the media capture device, whether the event should be handled locally at the media capture device or remotely at the second device;
when the event is to be handled locally, processing the event locally at the media capture device;
transmitting a message to the second device, intended to activate a hardware element on the second device;
activating a hardware element and the one or more user-perceivable interface elements on the second device, in response to the message.

As discussed above, with respect to claim 21 and 51, Cortjens is completely silent as to making any determination of interface support, and that even if the system of Cortjens were to make an interface support determination, the determination is not performed “on board” a media capture device. Thus, Cortjens fails to teach or suggest “determining one or more user interface elements of a media capture device that are supported by a second device and that can cause one or more user-perceivable interface elements of the second device to be activated, when the media capture device is coupled with the second device,” as claimed in claim 67. Therefore, Cortjens fails to anticipate claim 67. Claims 68-70 depend on claim 67, and include additional features and limitations. Thus, claims 68-70 are also not anticipated by Cortjens.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 21-27, 29-39, 41-42, 44-53, 55-58, 60-62 and 63-70 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Cortjens.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejects claims 40 and 59 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cortjens in view of Creamer (U.S. 6,930,709, hereinafter “Creamer”). The Applicants respectfully disagree and submit that Cortjens and Creamer, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element as claimed by the applicants in claims 40 and 59. As discussed above, with respect to independent claims 21 and 51, Cortjens fails to describe or suggest making any determination of interface support. Even if the system of Cortjens were to make a support determination, the determination is not performed “on board” a media capture device.

Creamer describes a self-contained camera that can upload images or video directly to the internet based on user commands entered into the camera (Creamer, column 6, lines 29-58). Although Creamer describes the user-directed transmission of images or video, Creamer fails to teach or suggest making a determination of interface support “on board” a media capture device, as recited in claims 21 and 51. Therefore, Cortjens and Creamer, alone or in combination, fail to render claims 21 and 51, and thus dependent claims 40 and 59, obvious. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 40 and 59 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cortjens in view of Creamer.

The Examiner rejects claims 28 and 54 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cortjens in view of Maurinus (U.S. 5,606,365, hereinafter “Maurinus”). The Applicants respectfully disagree and submit that Cortjens and Maurinus, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element as claimed by the applicants in claims 28 and 54. As discussed above, with respect to independent claims 21 and 51, Cortjens fails to describe or suggest making any determination of interface support, and that even if the system of Cortjens

were to make a support determination, the determination is not performed “on board” a media capture device.

Maurinus merely describes a camera which wirelessly transmits raw image data to a separate image processing application before transmitting the image to a home interface controller (Maurinus, column 8, lines 39-51; column 2, line 60 to column 3, line 19). However, Maurinus’s transmitting image data to one process and then transmitting image data to a another process fails to describe or suggest making a determination of interface support “on board” a media capture device, as recited in claims 21 and 51. Therefore, Cortjens and Maurinus, alone or in combination, fail to render claims 21 and 51, and thus dependent claims 28 and 54, obvious. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 28 and 54 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cortjens in view of Maurinus.

Conclusion

Applicant reserves all rights with respect to the applicability of the doctrine of equivalents. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact William L. Jaffe at (714) 557-3800.